



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

regard. Mr. Sedgwick mentions (pp. 12, 13) Isaiah and Paul as writers one needs to know before reading Dante. They are obviously important; so are the Psalms; but if any Biblical author is singled out for the student of Dante, it must be Jeremiah.

If these allusions do not adequately characterize the book, one may add that the author approaches Dante with that Neoplatonic bias which in our day is common to amateur interpreters of poetry.

The Index (pp. 181-7) is not very full; for example, the reference to Wordsworth just noted, and references to other poets in the same connection, are not included. The little volume is not typographically so attractive as most of the publications of the Yale University Press, the print being small, and the words often crowded in the line.

There would be no harm in recommending Mr. Sedgwick's primer to the novice in Dante, were there not other and very good books of similar scope, easily attainable, by specialists in the subject. The recent *Life of Dante Alighieri* by Dinsmore (Houghton Mifflin) is better. So is Gardner's *Dante* (Temple Primers). It is a mistake in our author to suggest that he has been able to produce a more useful introduction to the poet because he is not a scholar—a mistake that is too frequently made in this country. How much more likely is Butler's *Introduction to Dante* to win the beginner; how well written it is! Even that would have been more effective had Butler been as adept in Dantesque scholarship as Moore. But doubtless the best introduction to Dante, at once popular and meeting the demands of present-day scholarship, is that of Toynbee (*Dante Alighieri, his Life and Works*, fourth ed., 1910).

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

NOTES

Acknowledgment

As author of *Christianopolis, an Ideal State of the Seventeenth Century* I desire to make some acknowledgment of the space devoted to a review which appears in the July (1918) number of the *Modern Language Review*, and I feel obligated at the same time to respond briefly to the comments passed upon the monograph by Dr. G. C. Moore Smith, the writer of the review. I am all the more desirous of doing this because some correspondence was carried on by Dr. Smith and me while the book was in preparation, as a result of which Dr. Smith's edition of Bacon's *New Atlantis*¹ and one of his articles from the *Athenaeum*² appear in my bibliography.

¹ G. C. Moore Smith, *Francis Bacon's New Atlantis*, Cambridge Press 1909.

² G. C. Moore Smith, The Date of the *New Atlantis* (In the *Athenaeum*, Feb. 1900).

Christianopolis, an Ideal State of the Seventeenth Century is primarily a critical study of utopias of the seventeenth century with what would seem to be a sufficient review of ideal states of earlier times, and its purpose (as mentioned in the introduction³) is to establish for Andreae's *Christianopolis* a firm place among them. As an appendix, and quite apart from the work itself, I have added in the same volume an English translation of the *Christianopolis*, which was originally written in Latin. Dr Smith has gone to considerable trouble and has taken great pains to criticize the translation unfavorably as to its accuracy and also from the view point of English style. While I do not wish to minimize the importance of these features by any means and while I gratefully accept some of his suggestions, I must express regret that an equal amount, at least, of effort and talent were not made available for an analysis of the former and major part of the work. For, aside from a very short sketch of Andreae's life, the review considers only a few scattered statements of the arguments, and the comments on these do not show any very deep insight into, or clear knowledge, of the utopias concerned.

The criticisms made are of such a nature that I feel justified in referring to some of them individually.

a) ". . . there is no proper bibliography." b) "No clear account of Andreae's various literary productions is given."⁴ References to Andreae, especially during the 17th and 18th centuries, are many. But commentators on the *Christianopolis* that have *anything new to offer* are comparatively few. The bibliography was purposely limited to the latter. The chief works of Andreae are suggested in the introductory chapter and elsewhere⁵ as is also the fact that he was an authority in many departments of knowledge. But to have given even a brief account of these works would have carried the proposed volume far beyond its intended limits. I have quoted from the *Fama Fraternitas* especially, as this work (except of course the *Christianopolis*) has the closest bearing on the matter under discussion. A further analysis of Andreae's writings and their relation to Education, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology may follow at some future time.

c) "Dr. Held . . . like a good editor minimizes any obligation he (Andreae) had to Moore and Campanella."⁶ I refer Dr. Smith to Chapter II of my book, and particularly to pages 21 and 22. Here I have suggested Andreae's knowledge and appreciation of both the *Utopia* and *Civitas Solis*. Andreae himself mentions both. My argument is, however, that Andreae, though having read both of these ideal states carefully, does not copy their contents (as he has been accused of doing), but has embodied in his *Christianopolis* new and purer principles of government and social life.

d) ". . . but the arguments establish probabilities and possibilities rather than certainties."⁷ The careful scholar, dealing with seventeenth century literature, will guard against "establishing certainties." I call Dr. Smith's attention again to my introduction and ask him to note the expressed purpose of the analysis.

An instance of Dr. Smith's misinterpretation of Andreae's *Christianopolis* can be readily seen from a statement in his short sketch. "All the boys are *herded together* in one building and the girls in another." In defense of Andreae I cite chapters 51, 52, and 53 which describe the quarters of the pupils, and the school; and I quote, necessarily at some length, from the 51st chapter as follows: ". . . I saw a school roomy and beautiful beyond expectation, divided into eight lecture halls where the youths, the most valuable asset of the republic, are molded and trained to God, nature, reason, and public safety.—All

³ *Christianopolis, An Ideal State of the 17th Century* (Oxford University Press 1916). Page 15.

⁴ The Modern Language Review (Cambridge University Press) Vol. XIII, No. 3. Page 369.

⁵ *Christianopolis*, page 14 and see index.

⁶ *Christianopolis*, page 15.

⁷ The Modern Language Review, page 370.

this is not after the infamous example of the world. For when the world seems to love her children most of all, she often shuts them up in some out of the way, unhealthy, and even dirty prison, where they are brought into contact with filth and become accustomed to such jails. Here (in *Christianopolis*) all is open, sunny and happy, so that with the sight of pictures even, they attract the children, fashion the minds of the boys and girls, and advise the youths. They are not baked in summer nor frozen in winter; they are not disturbed by noise nor frightened because of loneliness."⁸ Does this arrangement merit the expression of Dr. Smith?

Nor do I agree that "theocracy"⁹ is the proper designation for the elements of government at Geneva that attracted Andreæ. The quotation from Andreæ's *Autobiography*¹⁰ cited¹¹ should make this clear.

I inserted no translation for the letters S.I.C. and R.D.T. which occur at the beginning and at the close of Andreæ's dedication.¹² I am not convinced, however, that Dr. Smith's suggested interpretation¹³ of the evident opening and closing salutation is much more than a hazard.

I come now to the criticisms upon which most stress is laid in the review. Dr. Smith has selected twenty-three brief passages from the book, suggested that the translations were faulty, and without offering translations of his own (except of some particular word or expression in eight of them) he makes the statement that these are "sufficient proof of serious blunders on practically every page" and that the English is consistently "slovenly and inaccurate." Not wishing to take the space to analyze the merits of each passage (and in many of them the criticism seems to hinge upon the choice of a word) I offer in answer the statement of Professor Hugh M. Kingery, an American scholar,¹⁴ who has been kind enough to examine my translation. After commenting in detail on each of the twenty-three passages mentioned, he writes, "Though it seems to me that you have missed the point here and there, the reviewer's criticism of your knowledge of Latin is entirely too sweeping and your English has some *very decided merits*." (The underscoring is Dr. Kingery's.)

This further defense is I think justifiable. Before undertaking the translation in question, I had made a careful study of the thoughts and conceptions of Andreæ as reflected in the *Christianopolis* and other works, in consequence of which I have often and purposely held to expressions which seemed to me to give a more accurate picture of the time and of the man Andreæ than a more up to date phraseology would do. For after all I was concerned more with Andreæ and with 17th century utopias than with the Latin language in which this utopia happened to be written. I could cite numerous illustrations, but will content myself with mentioning two typical instances which occur within the twenty-three chosen by Dr. Smith, namely, the literal translation of the figure of the grindstone¹⁵ and the rendering of "humanitatis legibus" by "attractions of the flesh."¹⁶ Andreæ's works, Latin and German, contain many such pietistic phrases (as the latter) which I feel I have better interpreted by applying to them his own vocabulary (as I have found it) than by trusting to more regular and classical translations. Dr. Smith has, however, offered, here and there, some constructive criticism and "to this extent" (to use his own expression) he has my gratitude.

⁸ *Christianopolis*, page 205 f.

⁹ The Modern Language Review, page 369.

¹⁰ *Vita ab ipso conscripta* (F. H. Rheinwald. Berlin 1849) page 24.

¹¹ *Christianopolis*, page 27.

¹² The Modern Language Review, page 372.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 372.

¹⁴ Hugh McMaster Kingery, life-time student of classical languages, editor, and for 25 years Professor of Latin at Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana, now retired and living near Westerville, Ohio.

¹⁵ *Christianopolis*, page 162.

¹⁶ *Christianopolis*, page 147.

Dr. Smith is grieved that any "professed scholar" of the 20th century should be willing to cause to be printed such "slovenly English" (already noted) as that of which I am guilty in the translated appendix. I claim no place among stylists, and am free to acknowledge difficulties in turning Andreae's Latin into English, more especially as Herder¹⁷ finds it difficult to express Andreae's thoughts properly and honestly in German. But it is some consolation to note that the article of Dr. Smith contains expressions to which an exacting critic of English might take exception.¹⁸ And even as it is deplorable that scholars today are not properly equipped for writing smooth English paragraphs, and that we are "left sighing for the elegance and polish of two centuries ago"¹⁹ so it is to be regretted that professors of learning cannot criticize frankly and honestly the works of fellow seekers after truth, without permitting prejudices, national, professional, commercial or what not, to saturate their comments with sarcasm, exaggeration and (perhaps unintentional), misinterpretation.²⁰

Ohio State University

FELIX E. HELD

¹⁷ Johann Gottfried Herder, Vorrede zu Johann Valentin Andreae. *Dichtung zur Beherzigung unseres Zeitalters.* (Suphan) Vol. 16, page 592. "Valentin Andreae zu übersetzen, ist wahrlich keine Kleinigkeit, und ich wünschte beinahe keinen alten Schriftsteller, der dem Übersetzenden hie und da schwerere Arbeit mache."

¹⁸ Such as:

- a) Repetition of adversatives "but," "however," "but" in successive sentences (pages 369, 370).
- b) "Such *coincidences* must needs *befall*" (page 370).
- c) "—in which are *acted*—religious *plays*" (page 370).

¹⁹ d) "Yet he has at least given us an impression of the contents of an interesting book which few of us had ever heard of, he has done something to set it in relation to books before and after, and to this extent he deserves our thanks" (closing sentence, page 372).

²⁰ The Modern Language Review, page 372.

²⁰ I refer to such absurd statements as footnote three page 370, where Dr. Smith uses as ample proof of a "sadly defective knowledge of Latin" on the part of the translator the fact that mention is made once in the introduction (not the translation) of a work of Bacon, *De Sapientia Veterorum*. A misprint in the quoted title of a Latin work is as much proof of lack of knowledge of Latin, as would a like typographical error in the title of an English work be proof of lack of knowledge of the vernacular. The review has other such evidences of lack of candor.